## Virginia:

AT A CONTINUED MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 3:00 p.m. in the Bridge Conference Room located on the fourth floor of the Nelson County Courthouse, in Lovingston Virginia.

Present: Constance Brennan, Central District Supervisor

Allen M. Hale, East District Supervisor Larry D. Saunders, South District Supervisor Stephen A. Carter, County Administrator

Candice W. McGarry, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk Debra K. McCann, Director of Finance and Human Resources

Daniel Rutherford, Commonwealth Attorney

Absent: Thomas H. Bruguiere, Jr. West District Supervisor–Vice Chair

Thomas D. Harvey, North District Supervisor - Chair

#### I. Call to Order

Ms. Brennan called the meeting to order at 3:10 PM, with three (3) Supervisors present to establish a quorum and Mr. Bruguiere and Mr. Harvey being absent.

# II. FY17-18 Budget Work Session

The following table reflects changes made (in bold) to the considerations list during the meeting.

Considerations:			
Department		1st Draft Budget	Revisions
		Staff	BOS
<u>Finance</u>			
Finance Technician-part-time to full time	\$26,067	Funded	Funded
<b>Technology</b> (Update from Susan Rorrer)			
Replace phone system	\$70,000	*Funded	*Funded

Replace primary network server	\$20,000	*Funded	*Funded
BOS IPad	\$3,500	Not Funded	Not Funded
<b>Commonwealth Attorney</b>			
Supplement for Assistant Attorney	\$2,978	Not Funded	Come Back
Locally funded clerical position-part-time to full time	\$21,819	Not Funded	Come Back
Sheriff			
New position-full time investigator	\$50,000	Not Funded	Not Funded
Clerical position-part-time to full time	\$22,849	Not Funded	Funded
DARE	\$4,000	Not Funded	Not Funded
Police Supplies (Level funding of \$17,500 budgeted)	\$7,500	Not Funded	Not Funded
In Car and Body Camera System	\$133,050	Not Funded	Not Funded
Dublic Cofety, & Emergency Couries			
Public Safety & Emergency Services  Dispatcher Holiday Pay	\$7,920	Funded	Funded
Dispatcher Honday Fay	\$1,720	Tunded	Tunded
E911 Program			
CAD replacement	\$170,000	Not funded	Not funded
Animal Control			
Tasers	\$4,000	*Funded	*Funded
Building and Grounds			
New position-full time maintenance worker	\$44,470	Not Funded	Not Funded
Rent Increase (relocation of Planning/Building	\$11,964	Funded	Not Funded
Inspection)	Ψ11,501	Tunded	1 tot 1 unded
M. ( D. )			
Motor Pool	Φ100 000	ψΕ 1 1	T
6 Sheriff Vehicles plus equipping (original request \$254,448)	\$100,000	*Funded	Funded \$146,592
2 Building Inspections Vehicles	\$39,720	Not Funded	
1 Tourism Vehicle	\$20,000	*Funded	

1 Planning Vehicle (sold Subaru previously used)	\$27,500	Not Funded	
1 Animal Control Truck	\$30,850	*Funded	Not Funded
Community College (Refer to Agency Notebook)			
PVCC Capital Contribution (4 years)	\$12,375	Funded	
Planning			
FT Planner	\$56,590	Not Funded	
Thomas Jefferson Soil & Water Conservation (Refer to Agency Notebook)			
Level Funded	\$1,575	Not Funded	
Non-Departmental (Effective August 1)			
Local Employee Pay Adjustment (Compensation	\$321,323	Not Funded	
Market Analysis)			
Constitutional Employee Pay adjustment (2%)	\$46,653	Not Funded	
Agencies Descripting Increased Funding (Defeate			
Agencies Requesting Increased Funding (Refer to Agency Notebook)			
Health Department	\$8,262	Not Funded	
Region Ten	\$10,979	Not Funded	
Regional Library	\$12,058	Not Funded	Come Back
JABA	\$1,929	Not Funded	
JAUNT	\$2,501	Not Funded	
Shelter for Help	\$160	Not Funded	
SARA	\$100	Not Funded	
OAR	\$2,513	Not Funded	
Central VA Small Business Development Center	\$2,500	Not Funded	
Gladstone Senior Center Meals	\$746	Not Funded	
Rockfish Senior Center Meals	\$4,133	Not Funded	
Human Society of Nelson County	\$5,000	Not Funded	

	1	<u> </u>	1
Agencies Not Previously Funded (Refer to Agency			
Notebook)			
Piedmont Workforce Network	\$2,249	Not Funded	
Jefferson Area CHIPS	\$15,000	Not Funded	
Capital Outlay			
Transfer Station Excavator	\$150,000	*Funded	
Emergency Vehicles	\$320,000	Not funded	
E911 call handling system upgrade (carried over from FY17)	\$346,000	*Funded-\$150,000 grant	
Library Renovations	\$127,297	Not Funded	
Records Management Consultant	\$25,000	Not Funded	
PER County Office Building	\$70,000	Not Funded	
Transportation Study for School Division	\$7,500	Not Funded	
Transfer to Broadband Fund			
Increase to Amortized Connection Allotment	\$100,000	*Funded	
Transfer to VPA Fund (DSS)			
Increase Request (no increase in local funding)	\$114,370	Funded	
Transfer to Schools (Refer to School Budget)			
Increase Request for operations	\$664,788	Not Funded	\$385,000 Funded
School Buses (4 requested, 2 funded)	\$162,000	2 Buses Funded	
	\$162,000	Not Funded	
Capital Improvements-Priority 1 per CIP	\$2,353,900	Not Funded	

# A. Commonwealth Attorney Budget

Mr. Carter advised that the Board had requested that Mr. Rutherford come and speak to the two items listed on the considerations list as follows:

Commonwealth Attorney		Staff
Supplement for Assistant Attorney	\$2,978	Not Funded
Locally funded clerical position-part-time to full time	\$21,819	Not Funded

Mr. Rutherford stated that he was asking for supplemental pay for the Assistant Commonwealth Attorney because Nelson's position was the least funded in all of Central Virginia. He noted the amount he was asking for would barely catch them up to the pay of the Appomattox Assistant Commonwealth Attorney. Mr. Rutherford then added that his two requests were less than the savings the County realized from not paying for health insurance that was not taken by him and his employees. He also noted savings to the County from his attendance of conferences that were fully paid for by the Commonwealth Attorney's Association. Mr. Rutherford further noted that he had been able to purchase things in this fiscal year with vacancy savings that would not have to be purchased next fiscal year.

Mr. Rutherford further reiterated that he and his clerical person were not taking the County's health insurance and that savings could be used to cover his request to increase the Assistant's salary and make the part time clerical position full time. He noted he would remain in the Army until 2020 and would not be taking health insurance through that time; however he was not asking for a raise for himself.

Mr. Rutherford indicated that he estimated the cost of making his part time clerical position full time to be \$17,000 and the employee worked twenty-five (25) hours per week. He noted that his expenditures were not increasing; rather savings would be utilized and he would be within his budget.

Ms. McCann explained that Mr. Rutherford's submitted estimate of \$17,000 for that position had not included salary related benefit costs whereas she had calculated these in as shown above.

Mr. Rutherford advised that his first priority was getting his assistant a raise. He noted their workload had expanded and they were now prosecuting six (6) cartel members. He further

noted that there had been additional savings that were not reflected because there had been no County supplements to pay since the previous administration.

Mr. Carter noted that County supplements were earned and did not roll over from one person to the next. He explained the Board's policy that when the County gave a raise that was in excess of what the State gave; County supplements were given to equalize the overall raises. He noted that when new Constitutional office staff came in, they were started at the base Compensation Board salary with no supplements.

Mr. Rutherford then noted that if his part time clerical position was not made full time; he would like to increase her hours from twenty-five (25) to twenty-nine (29). He added that he had bumped her hourly rate up already using vacancy savings. Mr. Rutherford then advised that he and the Sheriff were on the same page in drug offense enforcement and prosecution and there would be many new cases forthcoming especially with the LOCKN festival coming up. He added that they would treat LOCKN attendees as they would any other citizens of the county and this would create an additional burden for his office.

Mr. Carter noted that in regards to the supplemental pay for the Assistant Attorney, the County did not usually pick out one person to provide a raise to. He further noted that they had no information regarding the tenure of the other Assistants in Central Virginia that Mr. Rutherford had referred to. Ms. McCann suggested that the Board could take this request under consideration and they did not have to make an immediate decision.

Mr. Rutherford then noted that the Assistant had taken a pay cut to come to Nelson and he was trying to bump him up to where he was previously.

Mr. Hale then noted his proposed budget showed a reduction of 4.5% over the previous year's amended budget and that included staff changes. Ms. McCann advised that the staff changes were already incorporated into those numbers and was the primary reason for the reduction.

Ms. Brennan clarified that Mr. Rutherford would like to bring the part time clerical person up to full time which would require an additional \$21,819. Ms. McCann confirmed that to be correct and her calculation was based on a full time salary of \$26,831 and associated benefit costs. Mr. Rutherford noted that the employee did not want the health insurance and that amount had been included. Ms. McCann noted this cost to be a little over \$7,764. She explained that it was included given that changes could occur anytime during the year and that would be covered.

Mr. Hale then asked if Mr. Rutherford had the same amount of staff as the previous administration and he noted that he did.

Mr. Saunders asked if the previous Assistant had a salary supplement. It was noted he did and that it was earned when the County gave a raise that was greater than what the state had given; however he had started out at the Compensation Board salary.

Ms. McCann then noted that the part time clerical position was not a Compensation Board position and was locally funded. Mr. Hale noted that a 2% raise was under consideration by the Board and that was not included.

Mr. Hale advised that the Board was waiting to look at overall compensation together and they would not make a decision on these requests right now. He noted however that it seemed there would be times when the County would want to reward certain employees with pay not connected to a regular increase. Mr. Carter noted that this was never done and Ms. Brennan concurred noting that would be performance based and although the Board had discussed this before; it was not ever implemented. Mr. Carter added that the Constitutional Offices were not under the County pay plan and would not be included in any pay for performance plan implemented by the County in the future.

Mr. Saunders asked if funding these offices could be done similarly to the School funding; where an amount was provided and they spent it however they wanted. Mr. Carter advised that would be very difficult, as this was more a State problem than a local problem, and they were seeing Constitutional Officers asking for this because the State would not address the compensation problem.

Mr. Rutherford disagreed and stated this was a Board problem and a prosecution issue. He added that in talking with other offices, such as Albemarle, their offices got County supplements on top of the base level. He added that the Compensation Board sets the floor for salaries. Staff noted that his position was in fact a state position whose salary was set by the Compensation Board. Mr. Carter noted that in Albemarle County, the Constitutional Officers were under the County's pay plan and the State money flowed to the County and the Board decided how it was used; which was not how it worked in Nelson.

Mr. Hale noted that the challenge they had was Nelson being compared to larger counties. Mr. Rutherford noted that Appomattox County was comparable in size and their pay was supplemented. He added that he was not trying to exceed what was previously done but rather was trying to reallocate funds and be practical.

Supervisors agreed by consensus to table any action until the full Board was present and no changes were made.

Mr. Carter then noted the contingency amounts as of the April 13, 2017 budget work session as follows:

Available:	<b>Beginning</b>	As of 4/13/17
Recurring Contingency	\$1,320,778	\$924,893
Non-Recurring Contingency	\$718,850	\$749,200

He noted that the increase in non-recurring contingency was due to removal of the cost of purchasing a truck for Animal Control since they could likely use the F150 super-cab from the Sheriff's Department.

Mr. Carter then advised that unless they wanted to dip into the fund balance, staff suggested that the Board stay within these contingency amounts when making changes.

Supervisors and Staff then discussed School Operations funding as follows:

# Transfer to Schools (Refer to School Budget)

Increase Request for operations \$664,788 Not Funded \$385,000 Funded 4/13/2017

Mr. Hale then noted that the biggest decision reached last meeting was the amount to give the Schools for operations. Mr. Carter advised that through an email from Mr. Harvey, the School Board wanted to meet on this and if not; they could email something to the Board.

Ms. McCann noted that her impression from the last meeting was that the Board may come back to this, so she was unsure if they should relate this amount to the Schools. It was noted that it was likely that the Schools were already aware of the number. Mr. Hale noted that regardless, a preliminary conclusion was reached and he thought they should let them know. He added that he thought if they wanted to respond to the number they should do so in writing as the Board was certainly open to written comments or updates. Supervisors agreed by Consensus to have the Schools put their comments in writing.

Ms. Brennan then confirmed the Board's decision on the additional operational funding of \$385,000. She noted that she did not think the Board should cut funding based on the same level of decrease in enrollment; because then programs would be affected. She added that it would not be good if they were cut based on limited enrollment. Mr. Carter noted that their enrollment had dropped by 300 plus students in the last ten years and he reiterated his overall concern that unless they implemented revenue enhancements after this year; the County could not keep pace with their requests. He added that neither the County nor the Schools were growing.

Mr. Saunders commented that he though the Schools could do things more efficiently and he noted that he had heard many comments coming from teachers about the level of waste they see and they supported his pushing this issue.

In response to questions regarding their request, Ms. McCann advised that they had shown \$270,650 in unavoidable increases on the list that was provided in the budget overview document; which was more than covered by the \$385,000 currently allocated.

Mr. Saunders noted that Tye River Elementary School was not yet accredited and instead of getting rid of ineffective people, they were promoted or moved around.

No change was made by the Board.

Supervisors and Staff then revisited the Sheriff's Department considerations as follows:

## **Sheriff**

New position-full time investigator	\$50,000	Not Funded	Not Funded	4/13/2017
Clerical position-part-time to full time	\$22,849	Not Funded	Funded	4/13/2017
DARE	\$4,000	Not Funded		
Police Supplies (Level funding of \$17,500				
budgeted)	\$7,500	Not Funded		
In Car and Body Camera System	\$133,050	Not Funded		

### Police Supplies:

Ms. McCann noted that with regards to Police Supplies, previously things were bought with grants and those were still out there.

## Cameras:

Mr. Carter noted that he had spoken with the Sheriff on this and had encouraged him to give it time before purchasing the cameras, to look for grants, and utilize asset forfeiture monies. He added that funding this request would still work within the contingency funds noted. Ms. Brennan asked if he preferred the in-car or body cameras and Ms. McCann and Mr. Hale advised that they wanted an integrated system that utilized both.

#### Police Vehicles:

It was noted that these were shown in the Motor Pool budget as follows:

### **Motor Pool**

6 Sheriff Vehicles plus equipping (original request \$254,448) \$100,000 \*Funded

Ms. McCann advised that the budget contained \$100,000 which would cover the cost of three (3) sedans. She then noted that the base cost of the vehicles was \$29,648 rather than \$33,000 and equipping them was closer to \$6,000 rather than the \$8,000 in the budget.

Mr. Hale noted that the vehicles was their number one priority and they had argued that they needed vehicles with higher clearance and with all-wheel drive versus the sedans. He then asked for discussion.

Ms. McCann advised on the cost differential of the proposed vehicles noting that a base sedan with rear-wheel drive cost \$23,000 to \$24,000 and the base Ford sedan with front-wheel drive was \$23,229. Mr. Carter added that there was also a base Ford sedan with all-wheel drive for \$24,316.

Mr. Hale noted that the Sheriff had a point that there were many poor driveways in the County. Ms. Brennan asked if they could get a combination of vehicles and Mr. Carter noted their preference of getting all of the same vehicles and he added that they could get three (3) SUVs. Mr. Saunders noted that it appeared that other Counties were getting more SUVs and Ms. McCann advised that the pricing noted was for 2017s and the 2018 costs could differ.

Ms. Brennan indicated she supported them getting the SUVs and Ms. McCann noted that it would take a while before all of the sedans could be replaced with those.

Mr. Hale added that he agreed with the Board's previous discussion that they fund four (4) SUVs. Staff noted this cost was approximately \$146,592; which would add \$46,592 to the budget. Mr. Carter suggested this be funded with non-recurring contingency in order to preserve the recurring contingency and Supervisors agreed.

Supervisors then agreed by consensus to fund four (4) SUVs and nothing additional on the considerations list.

Supervisors then discussed Regional Library funding as follows:

## **Agencies Requesting Increased Funding**

(Refer to Agency Notebook) Regional Library

\$12,058 Not Funded

Ms. McCann noted that the Library had advised staff that this amount could be reduced by \$1,417. She noted that the increase requested included a salary increase. She noted that the amount paid for regional technical assistance had decreased; however on the operational side, health insurance had increased 34%. She added that increase coupled with the salary increase was the primary reason for their request. Ms. McCann advised that they would have to check to see if they were adding more part time hours or were increasing hours of operation. She noted that she thought they had two full time positions and one part time position.

Mr. Hale noted his observation was that the library was well used and he was inclined to give them their increase. Mr. Saunders questioned this versus not giving the increases to the Commonwealth Attorney and Sheriff.

Mr. Hale noted that the 2% salary increase included was the same as for the Constitutional Officers and Ms. Brennan noted she was happy to give it to them. Mr. Saunders noted that the County would have to spend money on repairs at the library.

Mr. Hale suggested a decision be tabled until the full Board was present and no changes were made.

Supervisors and Staff then discussed the transfer to the Broadband Fund as follows:

### **Transfer to Broadband Fund**

Increase to Amortized Connection Allotment

\$100,000

\*Funded

Mr. Hale asked for an explanation of this again and noted that he thought the Authority would be making money now. Ms. McCann noted that more people were connecting; however installation costs were amortized over five years and the funds were coming back in more slowly than they were going out. She added that the funds would continue to come back slowly.

Mr. Carter added that they will have added two hundred (200) new connections which cost \$150,000 if everyone got the discount. He noted that the problem was the last mile installation costs were high and most people used the discount and amortization. He noted that the discount was money gone; however the amortized installation was paid back. He noted that the original set-aside of \$250,000 for amortized installs had been exceeded and this would be further exceeded because of more connections coming on line.

Mr. Carter added that the discount was conducive to expansion; however if that were not continued, they could have more money to do something with. Mr. Hale indicated he was also skeptical about continuing the discount.

Ms. Brennan then inquired as to whether or not the Authority could look at grants to provide services to homes with school children in them. Mr. Carter noted that other Counties were trying to use E-rate funding to connect schools and in turn connect homes along those lines. He noted that all of the Nelson schools were already connected.

Mr. Hale noted that while he was getting voter signatures, he was collecting email addresses from east district residents for Broadband purposes. Mr. Carter suggested that unserved areas find a spark plug person in their neighborhoods who would get a bunch of interested people to sign up and then a cost could be devised. He added that they could also sign up on the website and IT was starting to aggregate those together to see if there were pockets in areas to be developed; which could be done by fiber or wirelessly.

Mr. Hale noted he thought there was enough concentration from Faber to the Rockfish area and he suggested that staff come up with the service requests from that area. He added that everyone says they are ready to pay for it if they can get it. Mr. Carter noted that he thought Stewart could serve them now from the Sugar loaf tower and Mr. Hale advised that another tower there may be needed. It was noted that tower costs ranged from \$150,000 to \$250,000 depending on if they were monopoles or lattice structures. It was noted that there was the

potential to put up smaller towers and relay from them; which was what Stewart did. Mr. Carter noted that the problem could be fixed if the funds were available and Mr. Hale supposed towers could be built if the discount went away.

Mr. Carter then inquired if the Board wanted staff to factor the sale of the Lovingston Healthcare Center building into the budget and Mr. Hale note he thought it should be factored in but not for operations; only one-time costs. Mr. Carter noted that Mr. Payne had drafted a purchase agreement that was currently under staff review. He added that it included keeping a portion of the property but it needed some refinement.

# **III.** Other Business (As May Be Presented)

There was no other business considered by the Board.

## IV. Adjournment

At 4:15 PM, Mr. Hale moved to adjourn and continue the meeting until Thursday, April 25<sup>th</sup> at 3:00 pm, for the conduct of a budget work session to be held in the Bridge Conference Room of the Courthouse in Lovingston. Ms. Brennan seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously by voice vote to approve the motion and the meeting adjourned.